

REMARKS

The Office action of July 1, 2010, has been carefully considered.

The allowability of Claims 5-9 and 12-14 has been noted. Claims 15 and 16 are withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-4, 10-11 and 18-21 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Hagio et al.

The recitations of Claim 4 have now been incorporated into Claim 1, thus reciting that a potting material is positioned in the holder member so as to cover the magnetic detector in the connector portion between the connection terminal of the magnetic detector and the main terminal. Claim 4 has been canceled and Claims 5 and 10 have been amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite that the potting material member is positioned within the holder member to encapsulate at least the magnetic detector. Claim 21 has been amended to recite that the potting material member is positioned in the holder member so as to further cover the connection portion between the connection terminal of the magnetic detector and the respective main terminal.

Regarding Claim 4, the Office action alleges that Hagio et al discloses that a potting material (epoxy, as disclosed in paragraph [0086]) is positioned in the holder member 65 so as to cover the magnetic detector 61, 62 and the connection portion between the connection terminal 61a-61c, 62a-62c of the magnetic detector 61, 62 and the main terminal 63.

Applicants disagree. According to Claim 4, the potting material covers the magnetic detector and also covers the connection terminal. This can be seen in Figure 19 of the present application, discussed in paragraph [0074] and [0075] of the present application as filed. Thus, the potting

material 102 is potted into the holder member 90 so as to cover each sensor IC 50(1), 50(2) and the connection portions between each connection terminal 55, 56, 57 of each IC sensor and each main terminal 61, 62, 63 and 64. It is possible thereby to prevent the intrusion of moisture to the electrically conductive portions so as to prevent or reduce the occurrence of shunt or short and migration. It is further noted that when the potting material 102 has flexibility, it is possible to protect each sensor from thermal stress, vibrations and the like.

These advantages are also discussed in paragraphs [0008] and [0057] of the application as filed.

Figure 12B of Hagio et al shows that the magnetic detector 61, 62 protrudes outwardly from the holder 65 and is not covered by the holder 65. This is also apparent from paragraph [0091], which specifically states that the detecting surfaces of the Hall IC 61, 62 are exposed from holder 65.

Accordingly, Hagio et al does not disclose that the potting material is positioned in the holder member so as to cover the magnetic detector and the connection portion between the connection terminal of the magnetic detector and the main terminal.

As to Claim 18, it can be seen that the potting material of Hagio et al does not encapsulate the magnetic detector 61 and 62 as discussed above in connection with amended Claim 1, and thus Claim 18 is patentable over Hagio et al.

Withdrawal of this rejection is accordingly requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. An early allowance of the application with amended claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Ira J. Schultz
Registration No. 28666
Attorney for Applicants
(703) 837-9600, ext. 23

Dennison, Schultz & MacDonald
1727 King Street, Suite 105
Alexandria, VA 22314